

MANNINGS et al  
Serial No. 08/793,502

In claim 1, line 5, line 6, line 9, line 11 and line 12, change "unit" to --part--.

In claim 1, line 13, change "unit" (both occurrences) to --part--.

In claim 17, line 3, line 5, line 6, line 8, line 11 and line 14, change "unit" to --part--.

In claim 17, line 10, change "unit" (both occurrences) to --part--.

In claim 32, line 2 and line 3, change "units" to --parts--.

In claim 32, line 4, line 6, line 9 and line 11, change "unit" to --part--.

In claim 32, line 10, change "unit" (both occurrences) to --part--.

In claim 32, line 16, delete "the common".

In claim 32, line 18, delete "may".

Please add the following new claims 53-56:

*18-53.* A system as in Claim 1, wherein the guidance information transmitted to the mobile part comprises instructions for decisions at road junctions.

*D 2*  
*31 54.* A system as in Claim *17*, wherein the guidance information transmitted to the mobile part comprises instructions for decisions at road junctions.

*32*  
*34 55.* A mobile unit as in Claim *30*, wherein the guidance instructions comprise instructions for decisions at road junctions.

D<sup>2</sup> 5156. A method as in Claim <sup>35</sup> 32, wherein the guidance information transmitted to the mobile part comprises instructions for decisions at road junctions.--

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

All pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that is regarded as the invention. The Examiner has raised three objections to claims 1, 17 and 32 relating to the recitation in these claims that mobile parts within an overlay area may simultaneously receive common guidance information associated with that overlay area. The use of the word "may" in apparatus claims 1 and 17 is believed to be appropriate inasmuch as it clearly defines a capability of the claimed apparatus. The use of "may" in method claim 32 has been removed. Further, it is respectfully submitted that "simultaneously" clearly indicates, not that any mobile part receives the information and simultaneously receives something else as the Examiner suggests, but that all mobile parts simultaneously receive the common information. Finally, the use of "common" is believed to be appropriate inasmuch as the information provided to the mobile parts in the overlay area is "common" (i.e., the same).

With respect to claim 32, it is respectfully submitted that "simultaneously transmitting" clearly indicates that common guidance information is simultaneously transmitted to the mobile parts, not that something else is simultaneously transmitted. In line 16 of claim 32, "the common" has been deleted to address the lack of antecedent basis noted by the Examiner.